

## **UBC History 490R: The Environmental History of British Columbia**

Final Report. David Brownstein.

### *Final Paper Guidelines.*

The report is due by 9am on **Monday April 10**. Please post it to the appropriate thread on Connect **as a doc file (if you intend to publish on cIRcle) or a pdf file (if you do not intend on posting to cIRcle, and you don't have a community partner)**. Late papers will be penalized by -10% per day. The paper should be no longer than 5000 words, not including abstract, bibliography, figure captions etc; I will not mark anything longer than 20 pages. This assignment is worth 25% of your final grade.

Once marked, you will have **five days** to incorporate feedback and fix errors, before sending it to your community partner for their approval. You will receive instructions for the publication procedure separately by email. **Note for those publishing, I will not release your course grade until your paper is up on the digital repository.** Anticipate that the publication process will take a few days.

### *General instructions.*

Incorporate the feedback that your peers and I have shared with you in response to each cumulative stage of your project, and treat your topic to the very best of your abilities. Rather than merely describing your issue, go some distance to creating original analysis, and argue your case against anybody who would care to disagree. Assume that I, as the marker, do not agree with your argument! Reports that are merely a repetition of your presentation won't get a good mark. You need to push beyond what you presented in class.

For those publishing on cIRcle. Title page includes the language "Report prepared at the request of [Community Partner Organizational name], in partial fulfilment of Hist 490R: The Environmental History of British Columbia, for Dr. David Brownstein."

Your first page ought to be an abstract. This is a short synopsis of the entire project (150 words max).

Maps, graphs and images are good, so long as they add weight to your argument. These are good tools for communicating complex ideas in less space than it would take using prose.

**Have somebody proofread your work before you hand it in.** Typos or other errors undermine your credibility as an authority on a subject.

Imperfect reports from past years can be found at:

<<https://open.library.ubc.ca/search?q=series%253A%2520%28Geog%2520AND%2520429%29&p=0&sort=6&view=0&circle=n&dBegin=&dEnd=&c=2&collection=undergraduaterearch>>

I look forward to reading all of your reports and will provide comments and editorial suggestions via email. See over for marking rubric...

**Rubric.**

	<b>Sophisticated 80 - 100</b>	<b>Quite good 70 - 79</b>	<b>Sufficient 60 - 69</b>	<b>Inadequate &lt; 60</b>
<b>Empirical Content</b>				
Report is an improvement over class presentation?	Yes, a leap forward over the material that was presented in class	Yes, a moderate improvement over material presented	A very slight improvement.	Exactly as presented in class. Presentation in recycled form
Title Page	Strong meaningful title, [as well as required language for library publication].	Appropriate title in need of minor edits, or possibly language missing.	Title in need of major edits and missing language for library.	No title and missing language for library.
Abstract, containing synthesized form of argument, conclusions and main points of evidence	Ideally structured and contains all required elements.	Present, but needs restructuring or small elements missing.	Present, but needs major editing or many missing elements.	Present in name only, or missing entirely.
Main text includes clear, strong argument	Yes, in the first paragraph.	Version of the argument present but not at forefront, or in weaker form	Perhaps buried in the document or in very weak form	Not present
Argument is logical, well explored, analytical	Logical, well explored, sharp analysis	Mostly logical, mainly well explored, analytical approach present, if in progress	Illogical elements, thinly explored, analysis did not play large part in the whole	Inconsistent argument, poorly explored, analysis either weak or absent

Evidence is adequate, accurate and supports claims	Rich details from the literature, archives and oral history interviews provide strong support	Good details from the literature, interviews or archives provides good support	More evidence is needed, but it was not collected or not deployed	Inadequate number of sources or interviews to support claims
Anticipates and defuses counter-arguments	Addresses weaknesses and counter-arguments in assertive fashion	Addresses weaknesses and counter-arguments, even if in weak fashion	Acknowledges shortcomings, but does not address them	No acknowledgement of alternative points of view
Critical of sources	Discerning reading of sources, even while making best use of them	Acknowledges some sources as better than others, even if no consequence	Treats all sources in the literature as equal in authority or utility	No acknowledgement of shortcomings, uncritical in approach
Clearly delimits project's bounds, and suggests avenues for future work	Boundaries around own original work are clear	Most boundaries are clear, if small elements missing	Boundary around the project is hazy	No attempt made to delimit project boundaries
<b>Structural elements</b>				
Appropriate length	Spot on	Slightly too short or too long	Very short, or very long	Simply inappropriate length
Writing is clear, careful and polished	Yes, error free and very well structured	Yes, though the odd error here and there	Errors peppered throughout	Very poor, extremely hard to read
Maps, figures, tables are clear, relevant, and well-integrated	Well integrated into the text, supports points being made	Well integrated, perhaps errors in attribution	Perhaps not integrated, or do not support claims	No integration, no attribution, perhaps irrelevant

Consistent use of proper citations	Footnotes used in clear manner throughout	Footnotes used, perhaps minor edits required	Attempted use, but many errors	Missing citations
Proper bibliography with sufficient use of relevant scholarly sources. Sections for Primary sources and secondary sources	Proper form, with authoritative command of the relevant literature	Good form, perhaps a few errors, perhaps important works missing	Acceptable form, still suffering from lack of sufficient sources	Major errors in form, or insufficient number of sources
<b>Creativity</b>				
Report is insightful	Student pushed themselves to make connections beyond what they have read	Student did a good job of synthesizing what they have read	Student was unable to make deeper connections in the material	Report does not show grasp of all elements of project
Topic covered in sufficient depth	Display of deep understanding	Good display of understanding	Elements here and there not covered in enough depth	Topic explored in thin fashion
Original, innovative, creative	The project contains original elements and creativity	The project contains original elements or creativity	While not necessarily original, entirely adequate	Project is neither original or creative